

REMARKS

Claims 2 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Sarraf in view of Buus. New claims 13 and 14 have been added.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being as being unpatentable over Sarraf in view of Buus.

Claims 2, 6, 8, 10 and 11 recite that the input laser power is varied as function of the distance of the laser light source from the printing surface.

Sarraf does not vary an input power as a function of the distance between the laser light source and the printing surface. Rather with regard to Figs. 1 and 2 Sarraf “provides signals to current drivers 86 in timed relation with the movement of drum 12 and printhead 20.” The timed relation of movement of drum 12 and printhead 20 in the Fig. 1 and 2 embodiments of Sarraf does not alter the distance between the laser of Sarraf in printhead 20 and the drum 12, as the laser moves axially and is not a function of the distance as claimed in claims 2, 6, 8, 10 and 11. In a Fig. 4, the lasers do move with respect to the drum via controller 98. However there is no discussion at all in Sarraf that the current is changed as a function of this distance and this controller 98 appears to have no effect or connection to current drivers 86. Rather this movement is “to focus the individual fiber end” onto the drum, which would not involve an input current change, as the focusing would occur with a constant input power.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 2, 6, 8, 10 and 11 is respectfully requested.

Also, there again is no reason or motivation to provide a distance meter, as the focusing discussed in Sarraf does not require such a distance meter. The purported motivation of maintaining a constant distance is not desired or wanted by Sarraf, as Sarraf specifically wants to move the distance as shown in Fig. 4. The proposed Sarraf/Buus combination makes no sense in

view of the Sarraf device.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection to claims 2 to 11 is respectfully requested.

Claim 12

Claim 12 recites the step of “varying laser power or exposure time while maintaining the focus distance so as to vary a spot size of image spots on the printing surface.”

The Office Action is not understood in this regard, as the Office Action recites column 1, lines 42 to 49, which states that the laser is moved, which varies the focus distance. If the focus distance is maintained in Sarraf, the laser power is the same. Also it is not understood how the focus adjusting means cited in the Office Action 20/36 maintains the focus distance if this means is adjusting the focus.

New Claims 13 and 14

These are new claims also respectfully submitted as patentable over the present invention.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:



William Gehris  
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940